# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

March 13, 1985

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meeting: April 10, 1985, Wednesday
May 15, 1985, Wednesday

B. Approval of February 19, 1985 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 13/MAR/85-1, Preliminary plans for restoration and renovation for station and commercial use, Massachusetts Avenue and First Street, N.W.

B. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

CFA 13/MAR/85-2, New office building, 9th Street, D Street and the 10th Street Mall, S.W., preliminary Southwest Urban Renewal Area.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 13/MAR/85-6, Pennsylvania Building, 13th & E Streets, N.W., revised renovation and addition designs.

2. CFA 13/MAR/85-3, National Theatre, 1321 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., facing Western Plaza; proposed banners on front of building.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, March 13, 1985

D. Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget

CFA 13/MAR/85-4, H.R. 47, a bill "To provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty."

E. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/MAR/85-5, National Defense University, Headquarters Library, Ft. McNair, additional studies of site and concept designs.

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-84, 1226 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., David Levy, Theatre lighting and signs.

2. O.G. 85-93, 1307 35th Street, N.W., Ralph Ferrara, Construct new curb-cut, gate, new off-street parking and deck.

3. O.G. 85-95, 3350 M Street, N.W., Forrest/ Marbury Associates, restoration and new mixed use construction, revised concept designs.

Appendix I.

Shipstead-Luce Act

S.L. 85-39, 500 H Street, N.W., New hotel building, concept designs.

Appendix II.

III. SITE INSPECTION

A. Vietnam Veterans Memorial
B. Fort McNair
C. Union Station

# REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-62 | 1634 32nd Street, N.W.<br>Delores G. Eaton | Renovations and additions |

ACTION: Recommend additional study. Concept of additional story and tower element are not recommended. Recommend proposed additions be lowered, and that design be more in keeping with simple character of existing house. Use of plastic bubble dome is not recommended.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-66 | 3621-3639 Winfield Lane, N.W.<br>Porten/Sullivan Corp. | New townhouses & garages |

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed new townhouses as shown on working drawings received and dated 12 February 1985. Proposed landscaping at Reservoir Road has also been approved. Note that the applicant has agreed to increase the height of the chimneys (see revised drawings).

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-71 | 3071 Canal Street, N.W.<br>Pennell Davis | Additions to residential structures: Concept |

ACTION: Recommend against concept of addition to residential structure as proposed. Any addition to the existing fabric of this block that would be visible from public space, especially the C & O Canal Historical Park, would be detrimental to the character of the historic district.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-73 | 1229 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.<br>1229 Wisconsin Avenue Associates | New commercial building |

ACTION: Issue permit for construction of new commercial building. Erect brick, mortar and stone sample on site for inspection and approval by Commission of Fine Arts prior to construction of exterior walls. Note is made that sidewall materials shall match brick in color and that there shall be a brick return front and back. Roof-top equipment is not part of this approval, nor are signs, or exterior lights. Soffits and ceilings in garage entry and loading area shall be a color similar to the brick.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-75 | 3238 R Street, N.W.<br>Philip Horowitz | Alterations & renovations |

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed changes as seen from public space and shown on drawings received and dated February 7, 1985.

---

# REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-78 | 800-900 30th Street, N.W.<br>Rosewood Hotels, Inc. | New office building:<br>Concept |

ACTION: Concept for revised north elevation is approved. Submit working drawings including landscape plans for review and approval by the Commission of Fine Arts.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-80 | 2750 Q Street, N.W.<br>Dr. & Mrs. Jesse Rubin | Renovations & loggia addition: Concept |

ACTION: Superseded by O.G. 85-99, received and dated 11 March 1985.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-81 | 3350 M Street, N.W.<br>Forrest/Marbury Associates | Restoration & new residential/office complex: Concept |

ACTION: Recommend omission of top story and gabled roof shapes to keep new construction below the cornice height and in keeping with the character of the historic Forrest/Marbury House. The general concept of the remainder of the project is approved for design development.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *O.G. 85-82 | 3270 M Street, N.W.<br>Georgetown Park II Associates | New retail complex:<br>Concept |

ACTION: Concept designs for parking ramp are approved. Submit working drawings for review and approval of Commission of Fine Arts.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-86 | 3280 M Street, N.W.<br>Manilla | Replacement awning with sign |

ACTION: Issue permit for green canvas replacement awning and sign for new business as shown on rendering received and dated 22 February 1985.

---

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-87 | 1415 31st Street, N.W.<br>John & Sarah Mashek | Enclose light-well |

ACTION: Issue permit for first floor enclosure of existing light-well at south side of residential structure shown on drawing received and dated 28 February 1985.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-88 | 3336 O Street, N.W.<br>Lew & Barbara Nosanow | Kitchen window replacement |

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation including replacement of existing kitchen window with larger opening having fixed sash and muntins.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-89 | 3270 P Street, N.W.<br>Nancy Olmstead | Sunroom addition to kitchen: Concept |

ACTION: No objection to concept of sunroom at this location or to proposed design. Submit working drawings for review and approval by Commission prior to issuance of permit.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-90 | 1628 29th Street, N.W.<br>Aldus H. Chapin | Two story rear addition: Concept |

ACTION: No objection to the concept of a conservatory addition at this location. Recommend restudy of dormers.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-94 | 1633 31st Street, N.W.<br>Catherine S. Jones | Raze cottage, build garage/studio & greenhouse: Concept |

ACTION: No objection to the concept of the proposed carriage house as shown on drawings received and dated 28 February 1985, provided that research on the structure to be razed proves that its demolition will not be a detriment to the Historic District. Recommend submission of separate demolition permit containing historical information on structure prior to submission of working drawings for proposed new building.

---

# REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-96 | 3601 O Street, N.W.<br>Georgetown University | New residential building |

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed residential structure as shown on drawings received and dated 1 March 1985. Note approved changes to design on supplemental sheets six and eight dated 6 March 1985. Recommend sample brick and mortar panel erected onsite for approval prior to start of construction.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| O.G. 85-99 | 2750 Q Street, N.W.<br>Dr. & Mrs. Jesse Rubin | Renovations & loggia addition |

ACTION: Issue permit for renovations and addition of loggia as shown on drawings received and dated 11 March 1985. Note: Final drawings are labeled O.G. 85-80.

---

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

| NO. | ADDRESS AND OWNER | PROJECT |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 85-30 | 7520 16th Street, N.W.<br>Elijah & Vernell Marshall | Swimming pool & spa w/fence |

ACTION: No objection to proposed work. Not in CFA jurisdiction.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 85-33 | 2116 F Street, N.W.<br>Richard D. Bernstein | Landscaping |

ACTION: Issue permit for landscaping as shown on drawing received and dated February 22, 1985.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 85-34 | 209 3rd Street, S.E.<br>Richard & Mary Weirich | Interior renovation & repair |

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation as shown on drawings received and dated February 22, 1985. No objection to removal of rear enclosed porch or installation of bay window.

---

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S.L. 85-36 | 501 13th Street, N.W.<br>13th & E Street Joint Venture | Window washing out-riggers |

ACTION: Issue permit for window washing outriggers as shown on drawings received and dated February 22, 1985. Outriggers to be painted light gray (to match building).

---

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary



708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066


MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

13 March 1985

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

| | |
|---|---|
| Members present: | Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman<br>Hon. Sondra G. Myers<br>Hon. Walter A. Netsch<br>Hon. Alan R. Novak |
| Staff present: | Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary<br>Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary<br>Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson<br>Mrs. Sue Kohler |
| National Capital Planning Commission staff present: | Mr. David Hamilton |
| D. C. Historic Preservation Review Board staff present: | Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp |

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 10 April 1985 (Wednesday)
15 May 1985 (Wednesday)

B. Minutes of the meeting of 19 February 1985: approved

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Union Station Redevelopment Corporation

CFA 13/MAR/85-1 Preliminary plans for restoration and renovation for station and commercial use, Massachusetts Avenue and First Street, N. W. The Assistant Secretary said the submission included plans for restoration and renovation of this landmark building, a new

train station, and development of retail, restaurant and theatre space. He introduced Keith Kelly, president of the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to describe the project. Mr. Kelly said it would be carried out under the 1981 Congressional authorization and would include the elements previously described by the Assistant Secretary. He said it was expected that the plan would enable the federal government to withdraw its maintenance and operating funds for the station. Mr. Kelly told the members that there would be 191,000 square feet of commercial space in the development (much of it made possible by the construction of mezzanines in the main hall and concourse areas), and 80,000 square feet of office space, in addition to the station functions. He said the Amtrak ticket area would be in a prominent location, on both the north-south entrance axis and the east-west axis of the concourse. He pointed out the seating and baggage areas and noted that the tracks would be moved 120 feet south to make them as convenient to the train concourse as possible. He showed old photographs of the building as it was in its early years, noting areas that would be restored. Access to the station was discussed next. Mr. Kelly said traffic studies had shown that 60% of those coming to the station would approach it from the northwest, along Massachusetts Avenue; 30% would come from North Capitol Street and 10% from the south and east. On a plan he pointed out the location of taxi ramps on three sides of the building, an automobile drop-off area, and bus lanes further out from the front entrance. Passengers arriving by taxi, bus or car would enter the front doors and walk straight back to the ticketing and seating areas. Mr. Kelly then pointed out the Metro station at the west side of the building and the parking garage to the north; those coming from the garage would reach the station via a series of escalators and a bridge. In answer to a question from Mr. Netsch, he said 50% of the passengers would come from the parking garage, 30% would be dropped off in front, and 20% would arrive by Metro.

Mr. Kelly then introduced Hanan Kivett from the architectural firm of Harry Weese and Associates. Mr. Kivett discussed the station functions in more detail, particularly the circulation from the various entry points to the ticketing and baggage areas. He then discussed the preservation and restoration aspects of the project. He said restoration work on the exterior would be completed, and inside, the hole in the floor of the main hall would be filled in, marble floors there and elsewhere put back and/or restored, plaster work and painting done, and all mechanical and electrical systems upgraded. Original lighting would be restored to the extent possible, and the concourse skylight, already restored by the Park Service to its original light-transmitting function, would have new nighttime lighting.

The next speaker was John Borg, from the development team. He discussed the retail aspects, commenting that the prime goal was to re-establish Union Station as an elegant, dynamic transportation center,

and to relate the retail not only to those using the station but also to the increasing number of people who will live and work in the area or come to it by Metro.

The Chairman told those present that the Commission's mandate lay in reviewing what is visible from public space outside the building, although the members would certainly welcome a restriction on the degree to which the interior spaces were developed. He questioned Mr. Kivett about the areas designated for office space and was told that these would be within the confines of the existing building and would not result in any changes to the exterior. Mr. Kivett said the only exterior changes would occur at the front of the building, in the loggia, where two windows, one on each side of the main entrance, would be converted to doors to allow service to dining areas in this space. Mr. Netsch asked a question about the logistics of getting baggage from the parking garage to the station and was assured that there would be elevators as well as escalators for this purpose. The Chairman asked about the use of trees inside the main hall; from the model, as one looked through the entrance, they appeared to be growing out of columns. Mr. Kivett said the trees on the model were only schematic representations and were still under study.

The Chairman told the project representatives that he thought the proposed development of the station could do a great deal for the area, which has suffered near-blight conditions for a number of years; he noted the beneficial effect of the Pennsylvania Avenue development nearby. There were no objections to the development concept nor to the exterior preservation and renovation plans and they were approved unanimously, with the expectation that detailed drawings would be seen later. Mr. Netsch commented that while the Commission could not speak to the details of the interior plans, it had in the past been blamed for them, specifically for allowing the hole to be cut in the floor of the main hall. He said he hoped that those agencies that did have this jurisdiction would look at the plans very carefully, in the interest of preserving the station's great interior spaces. Exhibit A

B. Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development.

CFA 13/MAR/85-2, New office building, 9th Street, D. Street and the 10th Street Mall, S. W.; Southwest Urban Renewal Area. Preliminary plans. The Assistant Secretary introduced John Nevius representing the developers, Kenneth Patton and Paul Busse, of the Aerospace Center. Mr. Busse explained that the Center would house the offices of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, which had decided to move its headquarters from New York to Washington. Jacquelin Robertson, the architect, was then introduced to discuss the design of the building. He said the wedge-shaped site was along the

Maryland Avenue corridor, near the railroad lines, an old GSA building, and L'Enfant Plaza. He observed that there were a number of buildings in the area from the 1920's and 1930's characterized by long facades and a finger type development behind; also, there was L'Enfant Plaza, with its pink/brown stone and extensive use of glass. He said both arechitectural styles had influenced his design. Drawings and a model showed a building with a long facade towards the south, in the manner of the older structures, the facade broken into three sections by narrow glass slots, which reflected the type of fenestration used in courtyards on the opposite side of the building. These three sections were seen as a finger type development on the north facade; at the apex of the site, to the west, was a curved glass element. There was a three floor pink granite base running around the building, with 1920's-type punched windows; a pink granite cornice was shown below the top floor. Windows above the third floor on the south facade were relatively small and flush with the wall surface; on the other facades they were large and based on the 20 foot bay seen frequently at L'Enfant Plaza. Walls facing the courtyards formed by the "fingers" were entirely glazed.

The members were pleased with the design and approved it unanimously, with Mr. Netsch noting that the Commission would want to see material samples when the working drawings were reviewed. Exhibit B

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 13/MAR/85-6, Pennsylvania Building, 13th & E Streets, N. W., revised renovation and addition plans. The Assistant Secretary showed the members photographs of the original facade design and recalled that restudy had been requested, primarily of the upper storeys. He introduced architect Robert Smith of Smith, Segretti & Tepper, who showed drawings of a revised design, pointing out the changes, particularly in fenestration, that had been made. The members agreed unanimously that the facade was much improved, and they approved the revised design. The Chairman said he had one problem, and that was with the penthouse, which was slightly off-center. Mr. Smith said the location of the penthouse had been determined by the column spacing of the existing building and would be difficult to change. The Chairman thought the red tile roof on the penthouse, although attractive, called attention to the asymmetry; he then suggested that if the northwest corner were champfered it would not be so noticeable. It was agreed by all that this might solve the problem, and the architect said he would make further studies incorporating the suggestion. Exhibit C

2. CFA 13/MAR/85-3, National Theatre, 1321 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., facing Western Plaza; proposed banners on front of building. The Secretary told the members that the staff had seen a demonstration in order to get an idea of the size of the banners. A flag 12 by 18 feet had been used, although the banners would actually be 12 by 20 feet. He thought they should be considered very carefully because there might be

other requests to use them on the avenue. He showed a photograph of the demonstration, and representatives from PADC showed drawings of the banners in place as proposed. The Chairman said he thought the Commission should keep the option of approving these on an ad hoc basis; he said the theatre was a cultural amenity, but some other uses might not be. James Rich from PADC was present and agreed that commercial projects should not be permitted banners. There were no objections to the size or the placement on the theatre, and the banners were unanimously approved. Exhibit D

Pennsylvania Triangle, hotel windows (PADC item not on the printed agenda). Architect Jacquelin Robertson showed the approved drawings for this facade and said the District government had told him the windows did not meet the code requirements, that they were too small for the size of the hotel rooms. He showed a revised drawing, noting that he had wanted to keep the horizontal banding and so had not lengthened the windows, but had used a wider window separated by a mullion for the sake of proportion. The revised design was unanimously approved.

D. Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget

CFA 13/MAR/85-4, H.R. 47, a bill "To provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty." Staff member Sue Kohler read this legislation providing for the minting of three coins: a gold five-dollar coin, commemorating the centennial of the Statue of Liberty; a silver dollar commemorating Ellis Island as a gateway for immigrants to America, and a half-dollar piece of the usual alloy (cupronickel) commemorating the contributions of immigrants to America. She said proceeds from the sale of these coins would be used for the restoration of the Statue of Liberty and the buildings at Ellis Island, and as it was hoped to get them on the market as soon as possible, the design review requirements had been changed to require consultation with only the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Chairman and the other members agreed that while authority could be delegated to the Chairman if necessary, there was no reason why the full Commission could not review the designs within the time required. The Chairman asked that this change, requiring review by the full Commission, be requested in the letter to OMB. It was also noted that trying to represent the contribution of immigrants to America on a coin posed a difficult design problem, and it was suggested that a symbol of this contribution--perhaps Liberty's torch--be used. Other than these comments, there were no objections to the intent or wording of the legislation. Exhibits E, E-1

E. Department of the Army, Office of the Chief of Engineers

CFA 13/MAR/85-5, National Defense University, Headquarters Library, Fort McNair; additional studies of site and concept designs. Staff member Jeffrey Carson said that while there were no representatives from the army or the architect's office at the meeting, there had been

some further site studies done, and correspondence between the architect and the army had been forwarded to the Commission by Colonel Alba. Mr. Carson gave each member a copy of this material. It was apparent that both the army and the architects, Ellerbe Associates, preferred to keep the original site plan which set the building far back from the edge of the Parade Ground. Their reasons included the following: A desire to keep the building from competing with Roosevelt Hall and not interfere with the views of the Capitol from this building; to stay clear of an underground power line; to avoid demolishing the Golf Pro Shop, thus making necessary time-consuming preservation procedures; and, lastly, by setting the building back, to allow the visitor to comprehend the whole facade as he arrives. The members did not consider these reasons valid and said they would like to discuss them with the army and the architects. The Secretary noted that NCPC would be reviewing the project in April and that master plan questions would probably be discussed at that time. He said the Planning Commission had already questioned aspects of the siting, plan and program. The representative from NCPC present at the meeting, David Hamilton, said there had been disapproval at the staff level. No action was taken pending a site inspection after the meeting. Exhibits F, F-1

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 85-84, 1226 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W., David Levy, theatre lighting and signs. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for renovation of the facade at the ground floor level, removal of an awning, and a new sign system. He said the Georgetown Board had had no objections to the architectural changes nor to the sign concepts, but had been concerned about the signs being too large and the lighting too bright. He said the suggestion had been made that the back-lit sign be placed 18 inches behind a grey glass transom, thus avoiding a sign violation because of size. Owner David Levy and architect Richard Stauffer were present at the meeting and discussed the size and lighting problems with the members. The Commission agreed unanimously with the Georgetown Board's report and requested that the architect go back to the Board with final designs and material samples.

2. O.G. 85-93, 1307 35th Street, N. W., Ralph Ferrara; construct new curb-cut, gate, new off-street parking and deck. The Assistant Secretary noted that the Georgetown Board, while generally against permitting curb cuts, had inspected the site, talked with the owner, and was inclined to grant an exception in this case. He said the curb cut had received approval from the ANC, neighbors, and the Board of Zoning Appeals; and as the street was primarily commercial, the Board felt that the screening and driveway gates to be provided by the owner would actually improve

the appearance of the street. The owner told the members that he was concerned with the proper appearance of his house and that he would make sure the gates were kept closed so that his automobile was not visible from the street. The Chairman suggested the owner look into the possibility of mechanical gate closers. The Commission decided that in view of the circumstances the curb cut could be approved, but it was noted that this was an exception to the general rule.

3. O.G. 85-95, 3350 M Street, N. W., Forrest/Marbury Associates; restoration and new mixed-use construction, revised concept designs. Mr. Carson recalled the Commission's objections at previous meetings to the general over-building on the site, and most recently, to the gable roofs and height on M Street. He said the Georgetown Board had seen a revised design since the last Commission meeting in which the gables and an attic storey had been removed. They had recommended conceptual approval for design development. The members looked at drawings and a model, thought the design much improved, and unanimously agreed to support the Georgetown Board's recommendations. The Chairman asked the owner, George Gerber, how much space had been lost by the most recent modifications. Mr. Gerber said an FAR of one had been lost, and although the economics were now borderline, he hoped the project would be successful. The Chairman said he thought the public owed a debt of gratitude to Mr. Gerber for his restoration of a Category I landmark and his willingness to make concessions for the cause of historic preservation. Mr. Gerber thanked the Chairman and said he would like to introduce Dr. Richard Howland, retired special assistant to the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, to comment on the project. Dr. Howland said he would like to commend both the proposed restoration of an important house and the sensitivity of the new additions. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Gerber said Dr. Howland would be acting as a consultant for the restoration of the Forrest/Marbury house.

Appendix I, approved. During the review of the Appendix, the Assistant Secretary introduced William Cochran, the architect for one of the Appendix items, a house for Georgetown University at 3601 O Street, N. W. (O.G. 85-44). He said Mr. Cochran had brought revised drawings for the O Street facade that had been approved by the Board, and that he would like the Commission to look at them. The members found them satisfactory and they were approved. When asked about the brick to be used, Mr. Cochran said a sample would be erected on the site for inspection by the Georgetown Board.

Shipstead-Luce Act

S.L. 85-39, 500 H Street, N. W., new hotel building, concept designs. The Assistant Secretary located the site, near the General Accounting Office, on a map; he said it was now vacant. He introduced the architect, Eric Colbert, who told the members that the proposal was

for a 200 room, modestly priced hotel. He said there would be ten floors above grade and two levels of underground parking. He showed the members a schematic model, placing the hotel in context with the other buildings in the vicinity, and also a color rendering. The rendering showed a red brick building with double hung windows, a light-colored stucco or precast band at the second floor level, and trim of the same material at the top. Mr. Colbert said that he had tried to make the building compatible with the historic structures in the neighborhood, such as the Pension Building and St. Mary's Church. He pointed out the space for air-conditioning louvers below the windows and said he was still working on a design that would integrate these with the windows in a satisfactory manner. Mr. Netsch said this would have to be done very carefully and the Commission would want to see the final details. The Chairman questioned the multiple division of the double-hung windows, noting that it gave them an industrial character; it was suggested that retaining just the vertical muntins might help. The Chairman also suggested to Mr. Colbert that the light-colored trim should be of the best quality material possible, and that it should not be too white. The conceptual design was approved with these recommendations.

Appendix II, approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 and the members left to make several site inspections.

III. SITE INSPECTIONS

A. Fort McNair

The Chairman, Mrs. Myers, Mr. Netsch, and staff members Atherton and Myer drove around the old parade ground, stopping first at the entrance terrace to Roosevelt Hall. It was noted that while the view of the Capitol might be obscured by a new building located on Fourth Avenue, the effect of setting the new library back one block to the east would be much more serious. This feeling was further confirmed when inspecting the actual site. It was also noted that the so called Golf Pro shop did not appear to have any significance architecturally and in fact removing it would be an improvement. After examining the four sketches submitted by the architect, it was agreed that Scheme "D" was the only plan they could accept. This scheme shows the new library on the site immediately to the north of Eisenhower Hall with the principal facade facing the parade ground set back slightly from the building line established by Eisenhower Hall. It was felt that it would be important in the future to have a building or wall on the line of the Eisenhower building on the north side of the new facility, to reestablish the edge of the parade ground.

B. Vietnam Veterans Memorial

Mr. Netsch, accompanied by staff members Atherton and Myer, next inspected some of the paving problems that have arisen at the Vietnam Memorial. Kent Cooper, the architect, and John Parsons and other NPS staff members first showed a scheme for enlarging the paved area around the statue. The existing plaza has proved to be too small, and many visitors, especially those wishing to photograph the statue, have been stepping over the chain fence onto the grass. Mr. Netsch felt the enlarged plaza was not only needed, but actually looked better in relation to the scale of the statue.

The granite sets on the paths leading to the wall were inspected next. It was apparent that many of the stones were loose since the material they were placed in was mostly earth, placed there for the purpose of providing a roothold for the grass that was intended to grow between the cracks. This condition obviously posed a hazard for visitors, especially these with impaired walking ability or in wheelchairs. Mr. Cooper made a rough sketch on the spot which illustrated his idea of re-laying all the sets in a concrete bed, with the concrete being nearly flush with the walking surfaces of the sets for a width commensurate with the width of the granite pavers. Outside of this central walking area, the concrete joint would be gradually lowered, so that at the outer edges of the walk, there could be room enough for an inch or two of soil in the joint, while the base of the set would be anchored in concrete. The soil in the joint would, it was hoped, support the growth of grass and thus afford a softening of the appearance of the walk.

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT A

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Mr. Kelly:

It was a pleasure to meet with you and your consultants at our meeting on March 13, 1985 and see plans for the renovations and new commercial facilities being proposed for Union Station. They look very exciting, and the Commission extends every best wish for your future success.

As we explained at the time, the Commission's principal interest is in the details of the exterior changes and the extent to which the new uses would be expressed on the outside. We are therefore encouraged to learn that little change is contemplated in this respect, and that apart from some small scale dining activities within the main arcade, all other activities will be confined to the interior.

We will expect, of course, that specific architectural changes, minor though they may be, will be submitted to the Commission for review at the appropriate time.

In addition, other items such as exterior illumination, directional or other informational signs, in short, any features that might effect the exterior appearance, should be included in future submissions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Keith Kelly, President
Union Station Redevelopment Corporation
444 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 740
Washington, D.C. 20001

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT B

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Ms. Petty:

The Commission was happy to meet with Larry Press and Stanley Sherman of your Department on March 13, 1985 and to approve preliminary designs for a new office building at Ninth Street, D Street, and the 10th Street Mall, S.W. The design, as presented by architect Jacquelin Robertson, was approved by the Commission as an appropriate addition to that part of the redevelopment area.

As plans progress, we look forward to seeing the final material samples and the working drawings.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Madeline M. Petty
Acting Director
Department for Housing and Community Development
1133 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 217
Washington, D.C. 20002

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT C

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Mr. Berliner:

The Commission met with your staff and Robert Smith, the architect for the remodelling of the Pennsylvania Building, on March 13, 1985. We examined revised preliminary designs and find the changes an improvement. Our one area of concern is the penthouse roof which is slightly off the center of the west elevation. Though this may not be readily visible from the ground when close to the building, we did discuss the possibility of chamfering the northwest corner as one way of increasing the apparent symmetry.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing final working drawings submitted through the D.C. Government prior to issuance of permit.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1220 North
Washington, D.C. 20004-1703

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Mr. Berliner:

At its meeting on March 13, 1985, the Commission considered a proposal to display two banners on the front of the National Theatre. The banners would be 12' x 20' (approximately the same size as the large flags flying in Western Plaza) and would be mounted on poles projecting from the face of the building approximately fifty feet above the sidewalk. The banners would be identical and announce current or coming attractions.

The Commission approves this specific proposal on the basis that the view along the axis of Pennsylvania Avenue would not be affected, and because the National Theatre serves a cultural purpose as opposed to one more commercially oriented such as a shopping arcade, hotel or office.

The management of the theater should be advised that it will be necessary for them to obtain a permit from the D.C. Government for the initial installation of the banners and supporting structural elements.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Henry A. Berliner, Jr.
Chairman
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 1220 North
Washington, D.C. 20004-1703

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT E

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Mr. Murr:

At its meeting on 13 March 1985 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed H.R. 47, legislation authorizing the minting of coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty.

There was no objection to the legislation, but it was recommended that line 18 of Section 4, Design of the Coins, be changed to conform to the standard wording and read, "the Commission of Fine Arts", rather than "the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts." While the members could delegate their authority to the Chairman if necessary, it was thought that review by the full Commission could be accomplished without difficulty within the time frame required by the program.

The Commission noted that the subject matter of the half-dollar coin will be "the contributions of immigrants to America." In view of the difficulty of representing such a broad concept on a small coin, it was suggested that one element symbolic of this contribution--perhaps Liberty's torch--be used as the basis of the design.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James C. Murr
Office of the Assistant Director
for Legislative Reference
Executive Office of the President
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

FIVE DOLLAR GOLD COIN

EXHIBIT E-1

99TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 47

To provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 3, 1985

Mr. ANNUNZIO introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs

---

# A BILL

To provide for the minting of coins in commemoration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Commemorative Coin Act".

COIN SPECIFICATIONS

SEC. 2. (a)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall issue not more than 500,000 five dollar coins which shall weigh

8.359 grams, have a diameter of 0.850 inches, and shall contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) The design of such five dollar coins shall be emblematic of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty. On each such five dollar coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year 1986, and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(b)(1) The Secretary shall issue not more than ten million one dollar coins which shall weigh 26.73 grams, have a diameter of 1.500 inches, and shall contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(2) The design of such dollar coins shall be emblematic of the use of Ellis Island as a gateway for immigrants to America. On each such dollar coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year 1986, and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c)(1) The Secretary shall issue not more than twenty-five million half dollar coins which shall weigh 11.34 grams, have a diameter of 1.205 inches, and shall be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) The design of such half dollar coins shall be emblematic of the contributions of immigrants to America. On each

such half dollar coin there shall be a designation of the value of the coin, an inscription of the year 1986, and inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(d) The coins issued under this Act shall be legal tender as provided in section 5103 of Title 31, United States Code.

SOURCES OF BULLION

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall obtain silver for the coins minted under this Act from stocks of silver held by the Secretary or from any other federally owned stocks of silver.

(b) The Secretary shall obtain gold for the coins minted under this Act pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under existing law.

DESIGN OF THE COINS

SEC. 4. The design for each coin authorized by this Act shall be selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Chairman of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation, Inc. and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts.

SALE OF THE COINS

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the face value, plus the cost of designing and issuing such coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses).

(b) The Secretary shall make bulk sales at a reasonable discount to reflect the lower costs of such sales.

(c) The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins prior to the issuance of such coins. Sales under this subsection shall be at a reasonable discount to reflect the benefit of prepayment.

(d) All sales shall include a surcharge of $35 per coin for the five dollar coins, $7 per coin for the one dollar coins, and $2 for the half dollar coins.

ISSUANCE OF THE COINS

SEC. 6. (a) The gold coins authorized by this Act shall be issued in proof quality only and shall be struck at no more than one facility of the United States Mint.

(b) The one dollar and half dollar coins authorized under this Act may be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities, provided that not more than one facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular combination of denomination and quality.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue the coins minted under this Act beginning October 1, 1985.

(d) No coins shall be minted under this Act after December 31, 1986.

GENERAL WAIVER OF PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. No provision of law governing procurement or public contracts shall be applicable to the procurement of goods or services necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act. Nothing in this section shall relieve any person entering into a contract under the authority of this Act from complying with any law relating to equal employment opportunity.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURCHARGES

SEC. 8. All surcharges, which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the Foundation. Such amounts shall be used to restore and renovate the Statue of Liberty and the facilities used for immigration at Ellis Island and to establish an endowment in an amount deemed sufficient by the Foundation in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, to ensure the continued upkeep and maintenance of these monuments.

AUDITS

SEC. 9. The Comptroller General shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the Foundation as may be related to the expenditure of amounts paid and the management and expenditures of the endowment established under section 8.

COINAGE PROFIT FUND

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) all amounts received from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be deposited in the coinage profit fund;

(2) the Secretary shall pay the amounts authorized under this Act from the coinage profit fund; and

(3) the Secretary shall charge the coinage profit fund with all expenditures under this Act.

FINANCIAL ASSURANCES

SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the issuance of the coins authorized by this Act shall result in no net cost to the United States Government.

(b) No coin shall be issued under this Act unless the Secretary has received—

(1) full payment therefor;

(2) security satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States for full payment; or

(3) a guarantee of full payment satisfactory to the Secretary from a depository institution whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or the National Credit Union Administration Board.

○

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT F

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Colonel Alba:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed your letter of 5 March and Scott Thorpe's comments dated 22 February at our 13 March 1985 meeting. We appreciate this evidence of cooperation concerning the proper treatment and future of Fort McNair. However, after visiting the campus on the afternoon of our meeting, we feel more than ever that our original suggestion of site is the right one, and that the reasons set forth in your letter opposing this choice are not persuasive.

These reasons include the necessity to move an underground power line, and the possible delay that may be encountered in securing permission to demolish the Golf Pro shop, part of which may have some historic significance. Also listed was the possible effect on views of the Capitol as seen from Roosevelt Hall, and views of the river from the atrium of the new building. None of these factors, in our opinion, is of sufficient merit to justify a major departure from the original, historic campus plan.

We would have no objection to the proposed acquisition of additional land presently occupied by WW II tempos. This area may well be suited for future additional uses such as housing, maintenance facilities, a new gymnasium and the like. It does not follow that a major academic facility should be put there when a more suitable and convenient site already exists in the proper context of the present campus plan.

While there are a number of such sites, including areas south and east of Roosevelt Hall, our first choice continues to be the site just north of Eisenhower Hall facing the old parade ground, as shown on Scheme 'D' supplied by your architects. It offers an excellent setting for the library, but more importantly it has the added advantage of preserving and enhancing the historic campus plan. Though set back slightly from the building line of Eisenhower Hall, it will continue to reinforce the general framing of the parade ground, and allow the new library to take its place as an important element in the central composition of major academic structures, as well as being easier to get to from the important buildings to the south.

As you correctly point out in your letter, care must be taken in the design of the building to ensure that its mass does not compete with either Roosevelt or Eisenhower Halls. If there is a way of further reducing the apparent size, all to the better. But in any case the key is to reinforce and preserve the integrity of the existing plan for Fort McNair, while enhancing the university's opportunity for future growth.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Michael S. Alba
U.S. Air Force
National Defense University
Project Manager
Washington, D.C. 20319-6000

# THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT F-1

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

March 28, 1985

Dear Colonel Hickman:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed your letter of 5 March and Scott Thorpe's comments dated 22 February at our 13 March 1985 meeting. We appreciate this evidence of cooperation concerning the proper treatment and future of Fort McNair. However, after visiting the campus on the afternoon of our meeting, we feel more than ever that our original suggestion of site is the right one, and that the reasons set forth in your letter opposing this choice are not persuasive.

These reasons include the necessity to move an underground power line, and the possible delay that may be encountered in securing permission to demolish the Golf Pro shop, part of which may have some historic significance. Also listed was the possible effect on views of the Capitol as seen from Roosevelt Hall, and views of the river from the atrium of the new building. None of these factors, in our opinion, is of sufficient merit to justify a major departure from the original, historic campus plan.

We would have no objection to the proposed acquisition of additional land presently occupied by WW II tempos. This area may well be suited for future additional uses such as housing, maintenance facilities, a new gymnasium and the like. It does not follow that a major academic facility should be put there when a more suitable and convenient site already exists in the proper context of the present campus plan.

While there are a number of such sites, including areas south and east of Roosevelt Hall, our first choice continues to be the site just north of Eisenhower Hall facing the old parade ground, as shown on Scheme 'D' supplied by your architects. It offers an excellent setting for the library, but more importantly it has the added advantage of preserving and enhancing the historic campus plan. Though set back slightly from the building line of Eisenhower Hall, it will continue to reinforce the general framing of the parade ground, and allow the new library to take its place as an important element in the central composition of major academic structures, as well as being easier to get to from the important buildings to the south.

As you correctly point out in your letter, care must be taken in the design of the building to ensure that its mass does not compete with either Roosevelt or Eisenhower Halls. If there is a way of further reducing the apparent size, all to the better. But in any case the key is to reinforce and preserve the integrity of the existing plan for Fort McNair, while enhancing the university's opportunity for future growth.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Colonel Carlos W. Hickman
U.S. Army
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Engineering and Housing
Headquarters U.S. Army Military District
of Washington
Fort Lesley J. McNair
Washington, D.C. 20319

MEETING:

10 April 1985